



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,097	07/03/2002	Daniel Daviller	P67745US0	5018
136	7590	03/10/2004	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC 400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20004			SAYALA, CHHAYA D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/088,097	DAVILLER, DANIEL
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	C. SAYALA	1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1-8, "characterized in that" should be replaced by - -comprising- - in claim 1 and by - -wherein- - in claims 2-8.

In claim 3, "chosen" should be replaced by - -selected- -.

In claim 4, line 2, "can" should be deleted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Aylen et al. (US Patent 5782951).

The patent teaches a mixture of urea and cement wherein the cement contains 2.9% MgO and 64.3% CaO. The particles are between 1.4 and 3.6 mm. See col. 3, lines 1-26. The carbon dioxide content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. It is for this reason that the rejection is being made under both statutes and the burden is being shifted to applicant to show that the prior art product is different. See *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226, (CCPA 1971); *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Van Mao (US Patent 5082488).

Van Mao teaches a composition containing MgO, 0.1 to 10% by weight and CaO, 10-25% by weight and plant nutrient components such as potassium and ammonium. Claim 1 shows the size of particles ("larger than 17 angstroms"). The carbon dioxide

Art Unit: 1761

content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. It is for this reason that the rejection is being made under both statutes and the burden is being shifted to applicant to show that the prior art product is different. See *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226, (CCPA 1971); *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hollingsworth (US Patent 3791810).

See claim 1 which teaches a mixture of ammonium polyphosphate and dolomite and calcium oxide, 5-35% by weight. See also col. 2, lines 35-40. The particle size is given at line 57. The carbon dioxide content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. It is for this reason that the rejection is being made under both statutes and the burden is being shifted to applicant to show that the prior art product is different. See *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226, (CCPA 1971); *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Judd (US Patent 4410350).

Judd describes a fertilizer with NPK ingredients, diammonium phosphate, potash, etc. that also contains at least 2% of calcium, magnesium or both, in the form of the oxide. See col. 3, lines 15-25. See claim 1, which teaches the size, minus six plus thirty mesh size. The carbon dioxide content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. It is for this reason that the rejection is being made under both statutes and the burden is being shifted to applicant to show that the prior art product is different. See *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226, (CCPA 1971); *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 55099992.

The patent teaches a composition with 35-45% CaO and 3-7% MgO with K<sub>2</sub>O, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and N containing fertilizers. See abstract. The size or the carbon dioxide content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. It is for this reason that the rejection is being made under both statutes and the burden is being

Art Unit: 1761

shifted to applicant to show that the prior art product is different. See *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226, (CCPA 1971); *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 2706077.

The reference teaches granulating a mixture of potassium chloride, and phosphate mixed with magnesium oxide and calcium oxide. The amount is described as being sufficient to form diphosphates of calcium and magnesium. The carbon dioxide content is not given and this office is not equipped to manufacture prior art products to that they can be compared with the claimed product in order to measure their physical characteristics in order to distinguish them for patentability purposes. The burden is being shifted to applicant to show that this is different. The size is not given, however it would have been obvious to granulate them to a size that would average a conventional fertilizer granulated product, which would fall within the claimed range.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

Art Unit: 1761

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
C. SAYALA  
Primary Examiner  
Group 1700.